safety in America. I can tell you here and now, this is the most egregious conduct I have ever seen.

Finally, with respect to the poor stay-at-home moms, because I see my distinguished colleague from Texas, who has got everyone sitting around the kitchen table time and, again, and stay-at-home moms. So the stay-at-home mom can get at the most, $250,000 or double, or less than that, whatever is less. I don't know what she gets when she stays at home and doesn't have any economic damage.

Or take the employee at McDonald's, a young woman who gets $15,000 or $17,000 a year working away, just married, taking the Dalkon Shield, totally injured, can't reproduce, her life is ruined. Oh, we are going to be liberal here. We will protect the small business and not the injured party and go right to the heart of the matter and give her twice her economic damage, twice $17,000, or $34,000, and the companies will write that off in a flash. We know it. You know it and I know it. It will just be a cost of doing business. And safety in America is really downgraded.

We have the most interesting safe operating businesses in the country as a result of this product liability.

There is not an explosion, Mr. President. All the reports before the committee say, wait a minute, there has been an explosion in business suing business—Pennzoil suing Texaco in Texas for a verdict of $12 billion. But, no, that is the consummate verdicts of all the product liability cases put together. There are businesses suing businesses all over. That is fine business. But when the poor injured party comes, and on a contingent basis finds a lawyer willing to take her case, do the investigating, do the trial, appeal work, and win a percentage if successful, oh, that is terrible for the economy in America; it is terrible for international competition.

Mr. President, in this global economy American firms contend at home and abroad against competitive foreign firms which operate in America. We have over 100 German plants, and over 50 Japanese plants. We have the BMWs, the Fuji Films, the Hoffman-Laroches—all these industries are coming to South Carolina, and not one is saying anything about product liability. They like what the States are doing, but we find a political problem because we have a representative downtown who is retained to get to the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, the conference board, and now the National Federation of Independent Business, saying this is just a small business. Oh, boy, it is not for large injury, I can tell you that. It is not for large injury. It is not for the consumer, Mr. President. The whole setup here is ramroded through. I can personally, just in my handwriting, sneak a little amendment on at the desk, but the rest of us can't because we have cloture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 27 minutes under the control of the majority leader.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the African Growth and Opportunity Act which has passed the House in March and is now before the Finance Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. I am the principal Senate sponsor of the bill which I introduced some fourteen months ago. There are ten co-sponsors.

I introduced the Africa bill because I believe that our policy towards sub-Saharan Africa should be revised to reflect changing global and regional realities. For too long, our policy has been based on country-by-country aid relationships and devoid of any comprehensive strategy towards the continent. As important as our child survival, health, agriculture, educational and humanitarian programs have been, they have not promoted much economic development, political stability or self-reliance. Nor have they benefitted the American economy. For that reason, it is time to re-evaluate our policy. That is the purpose of the African bill.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is the first serious attempt to formulate a new American strategy towards Africa. It provides a general road map for expanding economic engagement and involvement in Africa through enhanced trade and investment. It seeks to establish the foundation for a more mature partnership with those countries in Africa undertaking serious economic and political reforms.

I'm pleased to note that virtually all African Ambassadors have endorsed this bill. It has wide support in the American business community, non-governmental organizations, the African-American community, and the Administration. Indeed, President Clinton mentioned the bill in his State of the Union address in January and Secretary of State Albright included it in her list of the top four leadership challenges for 1998.

Let me summarize the bill.

First, it urges the President to negotiate free trade agreements with African countries with the ultimate goal of a U.S.-Sub-Saharan Africa Free Trade Area. The President will need Fast Track authority to negotiate this and other free trade measures and I strongly support that effort as well.

The bill establishes a US-Africa Economic Cooperation Forum to facilitate senior level discussions on trade and investment. No such dialogue now exists and there exists no long term agenda involving the private sectors here and in Africa. Doing business in Africa will require high-level dialogue and this Forum will signal to the investment and trading communities that we take Africa seriously.

Africa lacks the infrastructure needed to promote and sustain economic growth and development. The bill establishes two privately-managed funds to leverage private financing for small and medium sized companies. The two funds would operate under OPIC guidelines and require no official USG appropriations. One is a $150 million equity fund, the other a $500 million infrastructure fund. Given the enormity of the needs, these are modest sized funds.

Each of these initiatives will take time to mature. They have worked in other parts of the world.

The initiatives in the bill that would bring more immediate economic benefits to Africa and the United States would provide greater access to our markets for African exports. The bill authorizes the President to grant duty-free treatment for products now excluded from the GSP program—subject to a sensitivity analysis by the International Trade Commission. It extends the GSP program to Africa for 10 years, which is important for business planning and predictability.

The bill also eliminates quotas on textiles and apparel from Kenya and Mauritius, the two countries in sub-Saharan Africa which do not have quota-free access to the United States. They would receive this status only after adopting a visa system to guard against illegal transhipment of goods. Since global textile quotas are scheduled to disappear in the year 2005 under terms of the GATT, our bill merely gives Africa a small head start in a more competitive textile market of the future.

Some have argued that granting quota-free and duty-free access to American markets will weaken our domestic textile industries. If that were true, I would not be advocating this provision. African imports of textiles and apparel now account for less than one percent of our total textile imports. The International Trade Commission looked at this issue and concluded that enactment of our bill would increase U.S. imports of textiles and apparel from Africa to between one and two percent of our total textile and apparel imports, a negligible impact.

While this amount is small in terms of our overall textile and apparel imports, it can have sizable benefits for Africa. The lower costs of African textiles will also benefit American retailers and American consumers.

Warnings about the illegal transhipment of Asian-origin garments through Africa, under liberalized arrangements, are false alarms. The House strengthened these safeguards substantially during its consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that we have an historic opportunity to help integrate African countries into the world economy and to wind down our excessive dependency on public assistance as the signature of our ties with Africa. Africa is one of the last frontiers of untapped markets in the world. There are nearly 700 million people in sub-Saharan Africa. Yet, 33 of the world's forty-eight least developed countries are in Africa. Despite this, prospects for enhanced trade and investment are bright. Our exports now are twenty percent greater than to all the states of the former Soviet Union combined. Economic growth in Africa will create new markets and new opportunities for U.S. goods but that won't happen if we don't act to make it happen.

We now have an opportunity to help strengthen civil societies and political institutions and to assist African societies on the path to greater self-reliance, economic growth and political stability. Nearly thirty countries in the region have conducted democratic elections.

Private investment tends to follow good governance and economic reform but the private sector takes cues from government policies and involvement. It is very much in our interest to play a constructive role in the evolving political and economic transition in Africa.

That transition is taking place and must continue. If we had ignored Taiwan and Korea in the 1960s when they were at stages of economic development comparable to many African societies today, we would have missed enormous opportunities in East Asia. Years from now, I hope we can look back and be able to say that we were there at a crucial juncture in Africa's growth and development, that we played a constructive role in that change and that we did the right thing at the right time.

Mr. President, if the United States is a major player, a pro-active player in Africa's economic and political development, we will also be a major beneficiary.

I'm pleased the Finance Committee will be marking up the African bill later this month. I hope this bill will be brought to the floor as soon as possible for full Senate consideration.

I urge all members to take a close look at the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, look at the mutual long-term benefits it brings to Africa and to our country and support this important bill when it reaches the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Indiana in urging the Senate to move forward on the Africa trade bill. Who among us has not stood on the floor of the Senate when we voted on foreign aid and watched hundreds of millions of dollars spent by our government, knowing that this money was probably not going to be used in the end to help people, but instead would likely have a net product that was either crony capitalism or socialism, who among us has watched such a vote and not wished for an alternative?

We have an alternative today. That alternative is trade. The wonderful thing about trade is that it makes people equal in free transactions of buyers and sellers, producers and consumers. It creates jobs and opportunities, and we benefit together with those who are engaged in trade with us.

What we have in the Africa trade bill is a very modest proposal. The bill would allow the President, in those cases where a country in Sub-Saharan Africa has taken steps toward establishing a market-based economy, where a country is not engaged in a violation of human rights, and where a country is not engaged in activities contrary to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, to expand our markets and increase out trade with that country.

I think it is clear that there are business opportunities in Africa. I would like to see us as leaders in the effort to expand our mutual business relations. But the bottom line is we are dealing with countries that are hopelessly poor, and where poverty is a crushing presence in everyday life. We have an opportunity by expanding trade to help lift that weight of poverty, promote free enterprise, democracy, and the things that we believe in here at home, the things that we want people around the world to benefit from.

There are those who will oppose this bill because it will mean that people in Africa will be producing textiles to sell in the United States.

First of all, we must understand that today we do not have limits on textile imports from any of the countries in this region of Africa except two. Second, I think it is important to note, as Senator LUGAR mentioned, that currently all of Sub-Saharan Africa sells to us less than two-thirds of 1 percent of all the textiles we import. The International Trade Commission has estimated that under the best of circumstances, where this region of Africa experienced as much investment in producing textiles as possible, their degree of exports could never exceed, in the period of time we are talking about under this bill, about 3 percent of our textile import market.

Here is the question: Is it worth it to us to open up trade, and in the process bring goods into our country that our consumers can choose to buy or not buy if they believe that those goods are better or cheaper, and in the process make it possible for 750 million of our fellow human beings on this planet to have some of the opportunities we have?

Quite frankly, while the President went to Africa, gave a lot of speeches, did a lot of photo-ops, he has done far too little to push the passage of the Africa trade bill. Most of the opponents of this bill are in the President's party.

My basic position is this: I am tired of giving away foreign aid that does not work, that does not help anybody. We have an opportunity to let people produce products to sell on the world market. The worst thing that could happen to us from the provisions of this bill is that some poor working family in America would have lower priced textile products, could buy a shirt that is cheaper, or a shirt that they wanted more.

It seems to me that we ought not to allow greedy special interests who are already ripping off the American consumer—as we are paying more than the world market prices for textiles every single day in every store in America—we ought to be ashamed of ourselves to let a small number of special interest groups prevent a very modest bill from passing, a bill that could literally represent a turning point for 750 million human beings on this planet.

So I feel strongly about this bill. I think it is outrageous that we are not moving ahead on it. It does so little already that there can be no good objection to taking this very modest step.

I remind my colleagues that under the current agreements we have under the World Trade Organization, in the year 2005 all these textile quotas are coming off anyway. So all we are trying to do with this bill is help this continent, which is so poor, which has so much hopelessness, get a head start in producing textiles. We can help them lift themselves out of their grinding poverty.

There are some who will say, "OK; great. Let's let them. Let's make them use American cloth, and let's make them use American thread." The problem is that the costs in this competitive industry are such that you cannot ship all of this thread and fabric to Africa and have products produced there, and bring them back here to compete with products from those who are doing the same thing in Mexico for virtually no transportation costs.

So I urge my colleagues, when we are talking about nothing in terms of impact on our domestic textile market, when at worst we as American consumers will benefit, let us take this opportunity to try to open up trade with Africa, to let people enjoy the one system we know works—trade, economic growth, economic freedom.

I hope we will move ahead on this bill. It is going to be my goal, if we cannot get this bill to the floor through the committee, to offer it as an amendment on some other bill. I want us to vote on Africa trade, and move ahead.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Indiana and the distinguished Senator from Texas raised the question of the sub-Sahara bill. I had heard the expression that "trade," says the Senator from Texas, "makes people equal," and then went on, of course, to say that the sub-Sahara bill should not be blocked by "greedy special interests"; they shouldn't prevent the passage of the bill; "special interests," namely, of course, the textile industry.

What happens, in all candor, is almost like the Community Chest and the United Fund, ''giving at the office,'' doing your fair share.

This started way, way back in the 1950s. This particular Senator appeared as Governor back before the International Tariff Commission at the time that Tom Dewey represented the Japanese industry, and chased me around the hearing at that particular time whereby we were concerned that 10 percent of the consumption of textiles and apparels in America was represented by imports. And they had a provision in law under the national security section that you had to find before a President could take action, that there be a finding that the particular product was important to our national security.

President Kennedy, when he took office, appointed his Secretaries of State, Labor, Commerce, Defense, and Treasury—Secretary Dillon, at that particular time, Secretary Goldberg, Secretary Dean Rusk, Secretary Hodges, and then, of course, Secretary Freeman from Labor. And we presented the witnesses. The findings were that next to steel textiles was the second most important to national security; that we couldn't send them to war in a Japanese uniform.

Since that time, of course, there have been various initiatives whereby we have given more than ''at the office.'' We have given more than our ''fair share,'' so that in the limited time let me categorically state that two-thirds of the clothing in this Chamber this minute is imported. We gradually are going out of business, and more particularly, since NAFTA, have gone out of business.

What happens in my State, so as to understand, is that we have lost 24,000 textile and apparel jobs since the enactment of NAFTA in the State of South Carolina. We actually had 1 million apparel workers over the country when President Clinton came in, and we are down now to 781,000 in 1998. We have lost 219,000.

Rather than being ''greedy,'' Mr. President—that is what I really want to correct—the textile industry is geared up competitively.

You ought to go into one. Incidentally, calling them ''greedy,'' I have been through, I think, 13 of the Milliken plants. There is no bigger Republican than Roger Milliken. So you don't want to go around saying ''greedy'' Republican interests. Let's get away from that connotation, because the truth of the matter is you will find no more competitive industry than Milliken Textiles. They have won the Baldrige Award. They have set the pace for modernization, computerization, mechanization, and otherwise, electronically controlled. You ought to visit those people. They have cut back and downsized, and are extremely competitive, with the industry itself investing over $2 billion a year each year for the past 10 years, and trying to stay competitive and exist as an industry—not ''greedy'' at all.

But what really happens is that these jobs are extremely important to our economy. They average around $7 to $10. It is up to $10 now.

I am showing you a headline of Thursday, July 9, on breaking news in South Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA'S FACTORY WORKERS LOWEST PAID IN SOUTHEAST ECONOMIC GRADE

COLUMBIA, SC (AP)—For years, South Carolina has sold itself as a low-cost, low-wage place for businesses to expand or locate factories, College of Charleston economist Frank Hefner says.

''The kind of industry that comes . . . creates low-wage jobs,'' he said.

South Carolina doesn't win the engineering-intensive and research-and-development jobs that surround corporate headquarters. ''We're the piece shop,'' Hefner said.

But factory workers do not appear to have shared equally in the state's much-heralded economic boom, according to federal statistics that rank them the worst paid in the Southeast.

Still, there is some good news in the wage numbers. The factory jobs ''pay higher wages higher wages than farm workers and service workers,'' Hefner said.

Between 1990 and 1998's first quarter, the average wages of South Carolina factory workers grew by 17 percent to $10.44 an hour. During the same period, average factory wages increased 24 percent in the Southeast to $11.68 an hour>

As he seeks re-election, Republican Gov. David Beasley has proclaimed his administration successful in attracting new and higher-paying jobs to the state. His opponent, Democrat Jim Hodges, says workers have missed out on the economic good times.

The Hodges campaign this week pointed to an annual economic development study that graded South Carolina an F in economic performance.

However, the latest figures from the Corporation for Enterprise Development show South Carolina has improved to a C.

The 1998 study said strong employment conditions were key to the recovery. South Carolina had the third-fastest employment growth over the preceding year and the 13th-lowest unemployment rate.

Beasley says since his 1995 inauguration, South Carolina has attracted $16.5 billion in economic investment, creating 80,000 jobs. His administration, however, has been unable to provide documentation for some of its economic development numbers.

Some of the promised investments, for instance, may not be fulfilled for years and the state has said it does not check which ones actually are completed. It also has refused to identify all the companies doing the investing, thwarting easy checks.

Those new jobs largely have paid more than the state's low average manufacturing wage, Beasley spokesman Gary Karr said.

''The jobs we've announced over the last two or three years are getting close to $30,000 a year,'' Karr said. ''That's a huge increase (compared with) the average wage.''

The national average for manufacturing workers is $36,000 a year, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Karr said the bureau numbers miss the point. The low average factory wage does not reflect that higher-wage jobs are growing more rapidly than lower-wage jobs, he said.

First Union economist Mark Vitner agrees. ''The majority of (job) growth is occurring in industries that pay 20 percent above the average manufacturing wage,'' Vitner said. At the same time, the state is losing low-paying manufacturing jobs, particularly in textiles and apparel.

Still, low-paying textile companies with a total of 77,500 workers represent about one-fifth of South Carolina's manufacturing work force.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Chair.

''South Carolina's factory workers lowest paid in SoutheastEconomic Grade.''

So, on the one hand, we are ''greedy,'' because we are not giving our jobs to the Sub Sahara Africa bill. And, on the other hand, we are low paying and slovenly because we are not paying them enough as the industry and labor sees it.

So the textile manufacturers are caught between a rock and a hard place. There is no question that they are just as competitive as all that get out.

But Washington should sober up from this global competition singsong. Specifically, let's go to Oneita, a manufacturing plant in Andrews, SC, that made T-shirts. They had 487 workers. They closed down because they went to Mexico because anybody can make a T-shirt.

What happens, as we politicians say, ''Wait a minute.'' Before you open Oneita, you have to have clean air, you have to have clean water, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, minimum wage, plant-closing notice, parental leave, safe workplace, safe working machinery. All of that goes into the cost of the product. You go down to 58 cents an hour in Mexico and have none of those requirements. So if your competition leaves, you have to leave. So you are losing the jobs.

So the stance of the textile industry and the concern over the sub-Sahara bill is not ''greed;'' so-called ''trade'' makes people equal. Trade makes people unemployed.

That is what has occurred. We are here to represent the industrial backbone, the manufacturing backbone of this Nation. As Akio Morita said some years back, talking about Third World countries, they have got to develop a strong manufacturing sector in order to become a nation state. And then, looking at me, he said, ''Senator, that world power that ceases to have its manufacturing capacity will cease to be a world power.''

So we have the three-legged stool. On the first leg, the one of values, we are strong; the second leg, the one of military, we are strong; but the third leg over the past 50 years has been fractured economically. It has shortened. And that is the danger to the Nation's economy, and not just to the textile workers of South Carolina. It is a fundamental concern that these excellent jobs and excellent industries receive fair treatment.

We have done more than our fair share to spread capitalism in the Pacific rim, into Korea and everywhere else, down to Mexico, over into Europe initially after the Marshall Plan, and now to Africa. But let's see that we contain that industry in America's economic self-interest.

I yield the floor and thank the distinguished Chair.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask the Chair to notify me after I have used 6 minutes.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a member of my staff, Jason Small, be granted floor privileges for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me first join my colleagues, Senator LUGAR and Senator GRAMM, in support of the African Trade Group and Opportunities Act, and the reasons they have stated this is the right thing to do. It is in our national self-interest. It will do a lot of good.

(The remarks of Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2283 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are about to vote on cloture on a product liability bill, a product liability bill worked out with great care over the course of the last year and a half by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and myself, and the White House, to meet all of the objections contained in the President's veto message on the bill passed on the same subject about 2 years ago. Nevertheless, the demand to party loyalty on the part of the minority leader will almost certainly defeat this vote for cloture. That is highly regrettable as the arguments against it are entirely devoid of merit.

Just a few minutes ago you heard the junior Senator from New Jersey protest about the fact that cloture would prohibit the bringing of lawsuits based on gun violence. That is entirely specious for two reasons. The first is the amendment on that subject that is at the desk will be germane after cloture and can be debated and voted on. Secondly, and more importantly, the lawsuits by various States against gun manufacturers based on the tobacco litigation are not product liability lawsuits. Tobacco litigation was not a product liability lawsuit at all, and neither are these lawsuits. They simply are not affected by this legislation.

The real protest was outlined a couple of nights ago by the minority leader who said, "I hope that we have a good debate about how good or bad this legislation is. I hope we have an opportunity to propose amendments to this litigation."

Yesterday, about an hour before the time ran out for the filing of amendments, the majority leader came to the floor when only two or so amendments had been filed to ask unanimous consent for further time to put in amendments. The minority leader's representative objected to adding to that time. Nevertheless, there are 38 amendments on the desk on this bill, 28 of them by Democrats, 10 by Republicans. Many of those amendments, including several by the Senator from South Carolina, are germane and can be debated on and voted on after cloture.

Yesterday afternoon the majority leader offered to extend the time for this vote so that there could be debates on amendments before cloture took place. The minority leader turned down that informal request. In other words, there is no desire on the part of the opponents of this bill to debate amendments to the bill, amendments further restricting it or amendments on any other element of the subject. None whatsoever. It is a simple smokescreen to persuade Members who would otherwise be willing to vote for cloture and vote for the bill not to do so.

Night before last, other Members on that side of the aisle complained bitterly about their inability to debate totally irrelevant matters to product liability. They mentioned campaign finance laws. We had 2 weeks of debate on that subject. They mentioned tobacco legislation. We debated that subject for 4 weeks. They mentioned education reform. We debated that subject for 2 weeks and passed a bill which has now gone to the President of the United States. And they spoke of health care reform on which they have already rejected offers for debate but will probably accept some next week.

No, the claim that there has not been an opportunity to debate this legislation is based on one fact and one fact only—the desire to persuade Members who would otherwise vote for this bill to vote against the cloture motion and therefore to kill the bill. They will probably succeed in doing so, and it is a paradox that a bill that is much more narrow than the one passed by a significant majority of Members of this body 2 years ago and vetoed by the President, which now meets all of the requirements of the President, will be opposed by some Members among those who voted for the bill 2 years ago. It is, I regret to say, pure politics and has very little to do with the merits of the bill itself.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Senator notes it is after 10 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair.

I had very much hoped that the argument of politics would not be used in discussing this. I agree with much of what my distinguished colleague over these many years has said. But I think, frankly, that on the question of product liability tort reform there has been enough, sort of acting and sort of wanderlust faith on both sides of the aisle that we don't need to point fingers at each other.

My view towards this is that I would like to see, as the Senator from Washington indicated, a very modest bill which would be signed by the President to go forward. And I, after 11 years of working on this, am not willing to give up. I am not willing to say that I am going to put product liability to death. I am not going to be a part of that.

I will, therefore, vote no on this cloture vote because I still think that, arguments about politics to the contrary, neither side having totally clean hands on all of this, the controlling factor ought to be the substance of the bill, which I think is good, and that the controlling factor on a vote ought to be how one feels about whether or not one can continue to debate product liability and hope that the leadership will come together in some kind of an arrangement, as, indeed, in this sort of Kabuki dance there has been.

The majority leader last night vitiated cloture for today. The minority leader objected. The majority leader yesterday said there would be a period for filing of votes. A Democrat objected. On the other hand, there have been many problems on the other side.

So what I am trying to do is to promote product liability in a very modest form which will be signed by the President. And, therefore, I hope my colleagues will vote no on the pending cloture motion so we might have a chance to continue this discussion and hopefully work out something on this modest but helpful bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, this nation needs legal reform. This bill before us—if passed into law—will deliver exactly that. While this legislation is not perfect, it does a great deal for small businesses across this nation. And for that reason, it should be supported and I hope it will become law.

Before I discuss this matter further, I want to thank Senator GORTON for his tireless pursuit of legal reform in the area of product liability. Senator GORTON has worked hard on this important legislation for many years. I also want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for all his efforts.

Mr. President, I do have concerns regarding this bill. My primary concern with this measure is the narrow nature of the reforms it would institute. I had